

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 1-17 and 26 are now in the application. Claims 2-3, 5, 14-15, and 17 have been amended. Claims 18-25 have been canceled.

As requested by the Examiner in the second paragraph of page 2 of the Office action, the withdrawn claims (claims 18-25) are canceled without prejudice.

In the third paragraph of page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 11-13 as not enabling one with ordinary skill in the invention to make and use the structure under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Furthermore, the Examiner objected that the structures in those claims were not shown in the drawings.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that, in claim 8, the structures of the "dendritic structure" were unclear. However, "dendritic structures" on adhesion promoting layers are well known in the prior art. Numerous examples were found when searching the patent office database for semiconductor, "adhesion" and "dendritic structures". In particular, the Examiner can look at U.S. Patent No. 6,121,069, col. 7, line 3, or U.S. Patent No. 4,015,100, col. 8, lines 44-58, and Fig. 6. Furthermore, the microscopic dendritic structure does not translate well to drawings. In light of the numerous

references in the prior art, one with ordinary skill in the art of semiconductor adhesion would be able to make or use the invention described in claim 8.

Likewise, the term "bonding channel" as used in claims 11 and 12 is well known in the art. For example, see U.S. Patent No. 6,462,407. As evinced by the use of the term "bonding channel" in the prior art, one with ordinary skill in the art would be enabled to build and use the invention as claimed. Therefore claims 11 and 12 are enabled under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The term "conductor track" is enabled to one with ordinary skill in the art of semiconductor manufacture as evinced by its use in the art. The term is found in over 248 patents in the Patent Office's online database. See especially U.S. Patent No. 6,533,620. Accordingly, one with ordinary skill in the art of semiconductors would be familiar with this term and would be enabled to make and use the invention as claimed. Accordingly, claim 13 is enabled under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Accordingly, the specification and the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would

appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved.

In the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9 as being fully anticipated by Dando (U.S. Patent No. 6,051,875) under 35 U.S.C. § 102. As will be explained below, the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, a brief review of the invention as claimed is provided.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, an electronic component having the following features:

a semiconductor chip including a semiconductor material, said semiconductor chip having an active upper side, a passive rear side, and a sawn edge;

said sawn edge being formed of said semiconductor material and surrounding said semiconductor chip, said sawn edge having profile-sawn contours; and

a plastics composition forming a plastic edge, said plastic edge surrounding said sawn edge and being in a form-locking engagement with said profile-sawn contours. (Emphasis added by Applicants.)

In contrast, Dando teaches straight cuts through the semiconductor.

The term "profile-sawn contours" was chosen to exclude straight cuts through the semiconductor chip. "Profile" is intended to mean not a straight line, but a contour that enters the material of the chips.

To claim more explicitly this feature, claim 26 has been added. For the reasons discussed above, claim 26, like claim 1, would be patentable over Dando. If the Examiner refuses to enter new claim 26 due to the finality of the Office action, the Examiner is asked to telephone undersigned counsel so that claim may be deleted while the remainder of the amendment be entered.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-7, and 9-10 as being unpatentable over Dando in light of other prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Because these references do not teach or suggest the profile-sawn contours of claim 1, claim 1 is not obvious over the prior art.

In the final paragraph of page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 9 as being fully anticipated by Brooks et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102. As shown in Fig. 12 of Brooks, Brooks does not teach "profile-sawn contours" Fig. 12 of Brooks et al. shows that the plastic covers the entire active side of the chip and not only the

sawn edge. Furthermore, the device taught by Brooks et al. is no profile-sawn; the profile originates in two different steps; see col. 4, lines 38-59.

In the first paragraph of page 4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 16 as being unpatentable over Japanese document 2144946. For the reasons stated above, the invention as claimed is not taught by JP 2144946.

In the fourth paragraph of page 4, the Examiner objected to claims 2, 3, 5, 14, 15, and 17 for depending on a rejected base claim but indicated that they contained allowable subject matter. To correct the objection, those claims have been rewritten as independent claims containing all of the features of their base claims. Accordingly, amended claims 2-3, 5, 14-15, and 17 should be allowed. A payment of \$336 is enclosed to provide for the additional independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17 and 26 are solicited. In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, please telephone counsel so that patentable language can be substituted. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to
Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and
Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

LOREN DONALD PEARSON
REG. NO. 42,987

LDP:cgm

September 4, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 05 2003

OFFICIAL